EXHIBIT 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

. Case No. 21-mj-12036

VS.

•

MOHUMMAD SIMMONS,

. Newark, New Jersey

. February 3, 2021

Defendant.

.

TRANSCRIPT OF BAIL HEARING
BEFORE THE HONORABLE EDWARD S. KIEL
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

APPEARANCES (the parties appeared via Zoom videoconference):

For the Government: DESIREE GRACE LATZER, ESQ.

Office of the U.S. Attorney

District of New Jersey

970 Broad Street, 4th Floor

Newark, NJ 07102 (973) 645-2708

desiree.latzer@usdoj.gov

For the Defendant: RAHUL SHARMA, ESQ.

Office of the Federal Public Defender

1002 Broad Street Newark, NJ 07102

Audio Operator:

Transcription Service: KING TRANSCRIPTION SERVICES

3 South Corporate Drive, Suite 203

Riverdale, NJ 07457

(973) 237-6080

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording; transcript produced by transcription service.

1	<u>I N D E X</u>	
2		
3	Proceeding	<u>Page</u>
4	Proceedings	3
5	The Court's Ruling	23
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	(Commencement of proceedings)	
2		
3	THE COURT: We're on the record in the matter of	
4	United States of America versus Mohummad Simmons. It's Case	
5	Number 20-12036 [sic].	
6	If we could have appearance on behalf of the	
7	Government, please.	
8	MS. LATZER: Good afternoon, Judge. Desiree Grace	
9	Latzer, Assistant United States Attorney, for the Government.	
10	THE COURT: Okay.	
11	And on behalf of the defendant.	
12	MR. SHARMA: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Rahul	
13	Sharma on behalf of Mr. Simmons.	
14	THE COURT: Okay.	
15	Mr. Simmons, you can hear and see me?	
16	Just nod your head if you can.	
17	Okay. If any time you cannot hear or see me,	
18	please raise your hand or give us a signal, because I want to	
19	make sure you can hear and see everything that's going on	
20	today.	
21	Okay?	
22	Okay. Do you also consent to this proceeding being	
23	conducted by video conference today?	
24	Just nod your head "yes," sir.	
25	Okay. Why don't you take yourself off of mute?	

```
Looked like you didn't quite hear me.
 1
 2
              MR. SHARMA: It's quite loud over there,
   Your Honor.
 3
                         I know.
 4
              THE COURT:
 5
              All right.
                         There -- because there should be a
 6
   button for you to push to unmute yourself, sir.
 7
              THE COURT OFFICER: Mr. Simmons, there should be a
 8
   button to unmute yourself on the screen.
 9
                         Okay. Very good.
              THE COURT:
10
              THE DEFENDANT: Can you hear me?
11
                         Mr. Simmons, when I asked you, whether
              THE COURT:
12
    consented to --
13
              THE DEFENDANT: You can hear me?
14
              THE COURT: -- by video conference, I didn't get an
15
    answer from you.
16
              Do you consent?
17
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
18
              THE COURT:
                          Okay. Very good.
19
              All right.
                         I'm going to review -- and if you want
    to speak to Mr. Sharma at some point --
20
21
              All right. Anthony, if you could put him on mute
22
    as well.
23
              Thank you.
24
              All right.
                         We're here for a bail application.
25
    I understand that at the initial appearance last week or a
```

```
1
    couple of weeks ago, that Mr. Simmons consented to detention
 2
    without prejudice to making a bail application.
                                                      The bail
 3
    application has been made.
 4
              It's my understanding that defendant is proposing
 5
    that Ms. Tatiana Lee [phonetic] be a third-party custodian.
 6
   He'd be released to his custody -- to her custody.
 7
    Services has deemed her an appropriate candidate to serve as
 8
    a third-party custodian. And I presume everybody has
 9
    received the updated report from Pretrial Services.
              So Pretrial Services has made their recommendation.
10
11
              So I'll guess I'll hear first from the Government.
12
              Ms. Latzer?
13
              MS. LATZER:
                           Thank you, Judge.
                                              I mean, just
14
    reserving the right to respond after Mr. Sharma makes his
15
    arguments, since it's his motion.
16
              The Government's seeking detention here --
17
              THE COURT:
                         All right. I should ask Mr. Sharma
18
           That is true, and I --
    that.
19
              But go ahead, since you have the floor.
20
              MS. LATZER: Thank you, Judge.
21
              The Government's seeking detention here for a
22
   number of reasons, probably the most telling of which is that
23
   Mr. Simmons was arrested on some of the burglaries or one of
24
    the burglaries that pertain to this conspiracy and was
25
    released on conditions in the state court. He then continued
```

to commit a slew of additional pharmacy burglaries, this exact same conduct for which he had already been arrested while under conditions of a state court.

He was also placed on home detention from that state court judge. And that when we went to arrest him for this federal warrant, he was hanging out on a street corner in Jersey City with other known felons that at least the Government is well familiar with and ignoring all of the conditions that he had previously been placed on.

And that really is just the most recent example of a 10-year uninterrupted slew of Mr. Simmons ignoring court-ordered conditions. I don't typically place a lot of emphasis on juvenile conduct, but because of the fact that it really was the beginning of an impressive -- an impressive stretch of ignoring court orders, I'll just outline it briefly.

Starting in 2010, when he was 14 years old, he was arrested in -- I'm sorry -- he was sentenced in February of 2010 for two different arrests, one of which obviously occurred while he was on pretrial release, and he was sentenced to one-year probation at that time.

Two months into his probationary term, he was arrested with a gun. Three months after that, while now on probation and pretrial release, he was arrested again. In September 2010, he was sentenced to two years' probation for

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

those two arrests. And nine months into that probationary period, he's arrested with controlled dangerous substances. Two months after that, again, on probation and pretrial release, he's arrested with another gun. And his adult conduct is exactly the same. Starting in September 2013, he's arrested for distribution of controlled substances. A couple of months later while on pretrial release, he's arrested distributing narcotics. months after that, again on pretrial release, now for two pending causes, he's arrested distributing narcotics. resulted in a bench warrant. For those three offenses, he pled guilty in October of 2014 to distribution of narcotics on two of them and possession on one. And he was placed on a two-year probationary period. During that probationary period, he accumulated one, two, three, four -- four different arrests, I believe, all of which had to do with controlled substances, the distribution of controlled substances. Eventually, this results in a violation of probation, a violation of probation, held without bail with new charges. His probation ultimately is revoked, obviously, because he couldn't comply. And he's finally sentenced to five years' confinement in July of 2017. That is the only period of time in his entire life,

since he was 14 years old that he refrained from getting

1 arrested. 2 After he was released from that term of 3 imprisonment, he almost immediately resumed his criminal 4 career, again, with controlled dangerous substances. He's 5 arrested in November of 2020 on one of the pharmacy 6 burglaries that pertain to this conspiracy. 7 And I should also note for Your Honor, that this 8 conspiracy is obviously expansive. The Court knows that from 9 the complaint. But Mr. Simmons is a leader of this 10 conspiracy. 11 So he's arrested. He is placed on conditions from 12 a state court judge, which, honestly, is surprising to me, at 13 least looking at his record, given that he's demonstrated an inability to comply with anything. But he is released, and 14 15 he's given an opportunity to comply. And, again, he fails to do that. So he has committed additional crimes in addition 16 17 to ignoring the terms. I would note for Your Honor that that was in 18 19 November. He was incarcerated for a short period of time 20 while that was -- what's the -- while that was pending. 21 he's arrested for a new pharmacy burglary on December 7th. 22 And he's -- pretrial was denied on December 18th. 23 I think he was actually released -- sorry. He was released 24 on December 18th. And one of the conditions there,

Your Honor, that he be on home detention.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And the next day, on Saturday, December 19th, he went to Virginia. So he's on December 18th released from custody, on home detention in Jersey City, not permitted to leave, and the next day he goes to Virginia. December 20th, he's in Atlanta, Georgia. comes back then on December -- at some point between December 20th and December 23rd, he comes back, because on December 23rd, he actually goes to the -- I believe it was the Secaucus Police Department to recover his personal property. And later that day, he's actually observed with --I believe it was Rico Phang -- or -- I'm sorry -- Deon Davis. He's observed with Deon Davis on December 23rd. And one of the -- another condition of his pretrial release is is that he not have any contact with his co-defendants Rico Phang and Deon Davis, so he literally goes to the Secaucus police station and leaves with his co-defendant that he's not allowed to have any contact with. So whether the conditions are serious, like don't commit another state or federal crime, or whether they're routine -- stay on home detention where you're confined to or don't have contact with your co-defendants -- he literally cannot comply with any of them. And it's for those reasons, that the Government believes that he is a danger to the community and a flight risk. There is a bench warrant in his

past, but there's really no reason at all to think that he

will comply with any conditions that this Court sets. 1 2 And lastly, Your Honor, I would just note that it's my understanding that the -- the counties in which he has 3 4 pending cases, that they do intend to revoke his release in 5 the event that he's released on our case, because they too 6 share the concern that he will reoffend. 7 THE COURT: All right. Very good. Thank you very 8 much. 9 Mr. Sharma. Okay. First, Your Honor, just to 10 MR. SHARMA: 11 start with, what the prosecutor just said that the counties 12 intend to revoke his pretrial release, no, the prosecutors 13 intend to request revocation of his pretrial release. The 14 counties have not made that decision yet. And, in fact, when 15 the prosecutor --16 MS. LATZER: Okay. I apologize for that. 17 intend to represent that I knew what the courts will do. 18 The prosecutors do intend to seek revocation. 19 MR. SHARMA: And when the prosecutors sought 20 revocation on December 18th, in Secaucus, the court denied 21 that petition. 22 Now, since December 18th, Your Honor, he has -- so 23 I did not know about these -- I did not know about these 24 trips, apparently to Atlanta. I don't know what -- I don't 25 have that information in front of me. Apparently the

1 prosecutor has this information. I don't have it. 2 can't respond to that. 3 But what I can say is this. We are willing to, of 4 course, concede that Mr. Simmons has not -- has not behaved 5 properly on pretrial release in the past. And that is 6 exactly why he is -- we are willing to agree to the most 7 stringent restrictions on him, including location monitoring 8 and home incarceration. We have Tatiana Lee as a bond 9 co-signer and as a third-party custodian. 10 Now, I think that we could also -- since he has 11 had -- apparently had contact with certain defendants in the 12 case, we could also impose a condition of no phone usage 13 whatsoever by him. And we could even require Ms. Lee to 14 submit phone records, if necessary, to the Court to show 15 that -- to show that the only phone calls made from her 16 residence are when she is there and they are her phone calls. 17 Every single bit of Mr. Simmons' illegal activity 18 while out on pretrial release has been outside the home. 19 There is no allegation that he has maintained a residence to 20 commit any crimes. There is no allegations that he's ever 21 distributed drugs from a residence. There's no allegation --22 the prosecutor mentioned a couple of times gun charges. 23 Those are from 20- -- the last time he faced a gun charge was 24 In the last eight years, he has never faced a gun 25 charge.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The instant offense is for burglaries. And the burglaries at issue here did not involve a weapon. And this is not a presumption case, Your Honor. Okay? So given that it's not a presumption case, the Government, to find that he is a danger to the community, they're -- the Court must find that by clear and convincing evidence, by clear and convincing evidence, there is no combination of conditions that can reasonably assure the Court that -- I'm sorry? Let me just throw something out at you. THE COURT: I understand that these are burglaries and there wasn't violence or guns or anything involved. But the problem with burglaries is that they can lead into very unfortunate circumstances. When you break into somebody's business or you break into somebody's residence, that that comes with it a very inherent danger of a very troubling situation that could happen. MR. SHARMA: Certainly, Your Honor. And so, look, I think the Government pretty much says that their primary concern is danger to the community. His last bench warrant was 2015. Since then he has had no bench warrant; so in the last six years. I understand the Government reserves its right to arque risk of flight, but I think their primary concern is pretty clearly danger to the community. Under home incarceration with location monitoring,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

this Court can impose basically a "one strike and you're out' rule in this case. And this is exactly the kind of person who home incarceration was -- who home incarceration is perfect for, because --THE COURT: He was already on home incarceration under the state -- under the state charges back in December of 2020. As I understand it, when his pretrial detention was denied, he was released on Level 3 and my report indicates that that was 24-hour home confinement. And what I have from the complaint is that -- or what I have a proffer from the Government is that he doesn't care whether that's a condition in any event. I mean, how am I supposed to be confident in a person that gets the most -- most stringent and most restrictive conditions from a state court and flaunts it and doesn't care whether he violates that? How am I going to be assured that placing a bracelet on him is going to change anything? Because I do think that changes MR. SHARMA: things, Your Honor. He will be on a bracelet, and so he will know that one strike and he's out. And I do want to say that there's no allegation that he's ever done any criminal activity from home. be confined to the house 24/7 on a location monitoring bracelet. He goes outside the front door, he is out. will not hear me at a follow-up hearing. If that happens,

1 which I don't expect it to because I think he understands 2 that this is now the feds, this will be a bracelet, he will be monitored. He will basically have a GPS bracelet on him 3 4 that will be able to detect as soon as he leaves the house. 5 I -- there will be no argument from us, absolutely none 6 that -- for keeping him out if he leaves the front door 7 without permission. And as soon as that happens, Officer 8 Austin [phonetic] can file a violation petition. 9 And I just want to reiterate that there's no 10 allegation of him ever committing a crime inside the home. 11 There's no allegation of him conducting any sort of criminal 12 activity inside the home. And under <u>United States v. Himler</u>, 13 Your Honor, 797 F.2d 156, pincite 160, the Third Circuit said 14 that a danger to the community determination can only be 15 based on a finding that the defendant will commit one or more 16 of the crimes actually specified by the bail statute. 17 while burglary is absolutely a serious crime, Your Honor, and 18 we don't deny that and that will be dealt with at sentencing 19 in this case, it is not a crime specified by the bail 20 statute. It is not a presumption offense. And, therefore, 21 it is not the risk of him committing burglaries or the fact 22 that he did commit burglaries is not a valid basis for 23 finding him to be danger to the community. Now, if the Court found that he -- that there is --24 25 that there's no combination of conditions that can reasonably

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

assure that Mr. Simmons will not deal narcotics from home, that would be another -- that would be a crime specified by the bail statute. But notably, in Mr. Simmons' entire career, I do not know of any single instance where he is alleged to have dealt drugs from his home, where his home has ever been a home base for any criminal activity. Therefore, since he is not a risk of flight and the danger to the community determination -- the danger to the community of him committing a burglary can only be -- can only be used in setting conditions of release, it cannot be a basis for detaining him under <u>Himler</u>, Your Honor. And as this Court reiterated in 2016, a decision by Judge Linares, <u>United States v. Akinola</u> where Judge Linares said, having reviewed Himler, the Court agrees with the defendant that only the crimes identified in § 3142 of the Bail Reform Act would support a finding by the Court that the defendant poses a danger to the community. Okay. So that you're saying that under THE COURT: the case law, that an order to detain him, that there has to be a finding that he is a person that would commit one of the crimes that's listed under the rebuttal presumption provision of the statute. Right? MR. SHARMA: Correct, Your Honor. THE COURT: Is that what you're saying?

1 Okay. 2 Anything further? All right. 3 MR. SHARMA: Your Honor, I respectfully ask the 4 Court to -- if it so pleases, Tatiana Lee is on the phone on 5 her mother's phone and to hear from Ms. Lee about her 6 willingness to co-sign the bond and to serve as a third-party 7 custodian, not to, you know, tug the Court's heart strings or 8 anything, but to show the Court that Mr. Simmons, he 9 understands at this point, he's in federal court. 10 in state court. He would have a bracelet on. And that it 11 would be a "one strike you're out" policy, and that if -- and 12 that he would be putting his entire family in jeopardy if 13 that were to happen, especially because his wife needs to 14 work. 15 So I respectfully believe that the fact that 16 Ms. Lee works outside the home and requires child care from 17 Mr. Simmons would -- is a further reason to think that he 18 will not violate if he is braced on a bracelet and if there 19 is \$100,000 bond and a third-party custodian and any other 20 restrictive conditions that the Court believes are necessary. 21 THE COURT: I'll hear from her after I hear from 22 Ms. Latzer again. 23 I'm just -- you know, it -- it is amazing with the 24 technology, the things that you can do, and I appreciate you 25 giving me the pincite.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm looking at the Himler case, a Third Circuit And the beginning of it begins, "In this appeal from a detention order entered by the district court, we must consider whether, under the Bail Reform Act of 1984, an accused taken into custody may be detained prior to trial based on danger to the community where the detention hearing was justified only by an alleged serious risk of flight." And I haven't had a chance to review the rest of the case, but that seems to be slightly different than what you're saying. But let me hear from Ms. Latzer. MR. SHARMA: But at the pincite of 160, Your Honor, the court says a danger to the community finding can only be based on a finding that the defendant will commit one or more of the crimes actually specified by the bail statute. Your Honor does "control-F" for the phrase "actually specified by," you will find that quote. Judge, I think I can, like, negate MS. LATZER: this entire academic exercise, because there's more than ample evidence in this investigation that Mr. Simmons wasn't stealing these controlled substances for the fun of it. were dealing the promethazine with codeine in the streets of Jersey City through one primary, currently uncharged co-conspirator. And if Mr. Simmons would prefer that he also be charged at this juncture with a possession with intent to

distribute those controlled substances, there's more than probable cause to support that, and we could swear out an amended complaint today.

And at that point, it would be a presumption of detention case. But I can just proffer for the Court that the investigation has revealed that evidence, that they were distributing these narcotics. And it's the fact that Mr. Simmons has never once complied with a condition of release that gives everyone concern that, if given any opportunity, any leeway, he's going to reoffend or be a flight risk.

And the flight risk is also part of the Court's analysis, because his history demonstrates an inability to comply, whether those conditions are stay at home, don't communicate with your co-defendants, show up to court, these are all things that we have concerns about.

And I would also note for Your Honor that the state court judge who denied the request that the prosecutors request that his bail be revoked in December, I'm sure thought at that point that he would take the judge 's warning quite seriously. But I would note for Your Honor that the vehicle that Mr. Simmons was arrested in on this charge was used in two more pharmacy burglaries Hoboken, New Jersey, days earlier. So he's -- he didn't even listen in December of 2020 when he was told to stop committing additional

crime.

crimes. 1 2 And this reference to some sort of, like, one strike and you're back, I'm not aware of where that is in the 3 4 Bail Reform Act because there's absolutely no requirement or 5 practical justification that a court would allow someone an 6 opportunity to commit a new crime before we apply the Bail 7 Reform Act which directs the courts to protect the community. 8 For those reasons and basically -- I really can't 9 emphasize enough, Your Honor, that he's been given at last 10 10 different directives from judges in his 10 -- the last 10 11 years of his life to comply with conditions, including don't 12 commit new offenses, and has not been able to do that once. 13 The Government would ask the Court to keep him detained. 14 THE COURT: Okay. Very good. 15 Well, go ahead, Mr. Sharma. 16 MR. SHARMA: Thank you, Your Honor. 17 I just want to say very briefly that the operative 18 term in what the AUSA just said is in the streets of Jersey 19 City. And so whatever illegal conduct Mr. Simmons is accused 20 of occurs outside the home. And so that is exactly why he 21 would be under home incarceration. 22 As for the idea of one strike and you're out being 23 a ridiculous concept under the Bail Reform Act, I am not 24 saying that he be given the opportunity to commit another

The -- under § 3148 of the Bail Reform Act, the court

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

can revoke an order of release on a finding that -- not simply on a find that the person poses a risk of flight or a danger to the community, but on a -- but also on just a finding that the person will not follow the condition of release. And so what I'm saying is that under 3148 that the Court could very easily revoke as soon as there was any indication, which I don't expect there to be in this case, just as I did not expect in Moses Martinez's case and other cases where clients of mine have gotten home incarceration, because they understand that it's federal. They're on a location monitoring bracelet, and there's concern -- there's absolutely a valid concern about him not following the rules, but I believe that conditions of release can reasonably assure the Court -- not quaranteed, because nothing can quarantee, and that's not the standard under the Bail Reform Act -- can reasonably assure the Court home incarceration, strict home incarceration with location monitoring, a bond, and third-party custodian can reasonably assure the Court that the -- that Mr. Simmons will appear for all of his -will appear for all of his court appearances and will not pose a danger to the community. As for the -- as for the Government's threat of bringing a charge under 21 U.S.C. for dealing promethazine

with codeine, dealing promethazine with codeine, that is a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Schedule V drug, Your Honor, and so dealing promethazine with codeine would carry no more -- would carry a maximum sentence of one year in prison, and so therefore it would not be a presumption offense. Once again --THE COURT: MR. SHARMA: -- Your Honor. THE COURT: Go ahead. I'm sorry. I just want to reiterate we are not MR. SHARMA: asking for -- we are not asking for him to be allowed back out on streets. And he understands that this is far more serious than it ever was in Essex County. And that is -- and I understand the Court's unwillingness to say, well, why should Pretrial Services babysit him, or why should this be any sort of -- why should he get any sort of break here when he has been so bad on state pretrial release? I respectfully believe that that is because the standard is whether conditions of release, a combination of conditions of release can reasonably assure the safety of the community and his appearance in court. And I believe that home incarceration with location monitoring and a bond and a third-party custodian and, if necessary, a strict court order of no use of the phones while -- like unless Tatiana Lee is present and not with the defendant, I think that is absolutely appropriate here. But those conditions go to the

```
restrictiveness of the conditions, not the absence of any
 1
 2
    combination that can reasonably assure those things.
 3
              THE COURT: All right. Well, I appreciate your
 4
    citation. If you heard the printer going behind me, I
 5
   printed out the case, and I'll be sure to make sure that I'll
 6
    read it.
             And I will do that.
 7
              All right. So thank you for the good arguments of
 8
             I appreciate it.
    counsel.
 9
              Mr. Sharma, I don't think it's necessary for
10
   Ms. Lee to make a statement, but if you want to give her the
11
    opportunity, I'm open to it. Do you want to still have her
12
   make a statement?
13
              MR. SHARMA: Yes, Your Honor, if possible.
14
              THE COURT:
                         Okay.
15
              Ms. Lee, you can take yourself off mute, put
16
    yourself on video, and I'll hear from you.
17
              Ms. Lee, are you there?
18
              MR. SHARMA: Ms. Lee, have we lost you?
19
              THE COURT: She's there.
20
              Ms. Lee, there's a button in front of you that pops
21
    up that says -- asking you to unmute yourself?
22
              MR. SHARMA:
                           She might be busy with the kids,
23
    Your Honor.
24
              THE COURT:
                         All right. Very good. All right.
25
              MR. SHARMA: And it's fine. I don't want to -- oh,
```

```
1
    she's at work. Okay.
 2
              THE COURT:
                          We're running a little behind as well.
 3
              MR. SHARMA:
                         Okay.
 4
              THE COURT:
                         But that's not a reason not to give her
 5
    an opportunity. All right.
 6
                           I appreciate it, Your Honor, but she's
              MR. SHARMA:
 7
   not available, so we'll just --
 8
              THE COURT: Very good.
 9
              Well, as I said, I've heard the argument of
10
              I've seen the recommendation. I spoke to Pretrial
11
    Services. And at this point, I think -- well, I conclude
12
    that the Government has shown by at least preponderance of
13
    the evidence that no condition or combination of conditions
14
   will reasonably assure the defendant's appearance, as
15
              The Government went through a long litany of -- a
    required.
16
    very long criminal history of the defendant. I took that
17
    into consideration. The weight of the evidence against the
18
    defendant is strong. I've read the complaint.
                                                    It looks like
19
   he was on video -- videotape on many of the incidents that
20
   happened. He has a very long criminal history.
21
              And of particular importance to me was his
22
   participation in criminal activity while on probation,
23
   parole, and supervision. And I don't need to go through the
24
    entire litany again. That was summarized by Ms. Latzer.
                                                               Ιt
25
    is extensive. It is nonstop from the time that he's at a
```

```
very young age of 14 years old. And the only time that he
 1
 2
   has stopped his criminal activity and actually been in
    compliance with what's required is when he was incarcerated,
 3
 4
    starting in 2017 and a sentence of five years.
              I do note that he is on Level 3 release from the
 5
 6
    state on the charge in December 7, 2020, where he was with --
 7
    supposed to be on 24-hour home confinement. I heard a
 8
   proffer from the Government that he did not comply with that,
 9
    and the next day he went to Virginia and thereafter was in
10
   Atlanta.
11
              But I do note that there is a report that he has
12
   violated the monitoring and so scheduled to be heard, it
13
    says, on January 28, 2021. I am not sure whether that went
14
    forward.
15
              Ms. Austin, I presume that that was adjourned and
16
    it's on for a new date in.
17
              THE PRETRIAL SERVICES OFFICER: Correct, Judge.
                                                                Ιt
18
    was adjourned, and it has no date at this time.
19
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
20
              THE PRETRIAL SERVICES OFFICER: I don't know why.
21
   But I -- that is what they told me.
22
                          Well, I hear the state court is
              THE COURT:
23
   probably booked up like we are.
24
              And very much appreciate Mr. Sharma advising, I
25
    quess, his client through his oral argument the seriousness
```

of the charges.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But I don't think that he being in federal court is going to have any effect on his continued compliance with Pretrial Services supervision now that he's in federal court. I have no confidence that that's going to happen. I believe that the Government has shown by a preponderance of the evidence, therefore, that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure the defendant's appearance, as required.

And I was interested in Mr. Sharma's argument about the Himler case -- Himler, I think you said it was -- and I was looking at it during the time that he was arguing. to the extent that the secondary issue of the safety of the community comes into play, I do find by clear and convincing evidence is that there's no condition or combination of conditions of release that will reasonably assure the defendant -- or the safety of the persons in the community. The list of -- the list of offenses in the criminal complaint They are -- they happen one after the other. are lengthy. And I did have a conversation with Mr. Sharma about the inherent danger in burglary that could lead to very unfortunate circumstances. And I will take a look at the Himler case, and I'll be prepared to discuss it further with you, Mr. Sharma, on the next conference that we have.

But I find that both -- both reasons warrant Mr. --

```
or the defendant's continued detention.
 1
              So I will continue to remand him with the United
 2
 3
    States Marshal Service.
              Okay.
 4
 5
              Ms. Latzer, anything further?
 6
              MS. LATZER: No, Judge.
                                        Thank you.
 7
              THE COURT: Mr. Sharma?
 8
              MR. SHARMA: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
 9
              THE COURT: Okay. We're off. Thank you.
10
                      (Conclusion of proceedings)
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1 Certification 2 I, SARA L. KERN, Transcriptionist, do hereby certify 3 that the 27 pages contained herein constitute a full, true, and accurate transcript from the official electronic 4 5 recording of the proceedings had in the above-entitled 6 matter; that research was performed on the spelling of proper 7 names and utilizing the information provided, but that in 8 many cases the spellings were educated guesses; that the 9 transcript was prepared by me or under my direction and was done to the best of my skill and ability. 10 11 I further certify that I am in no way related to any of 12 the parties hereto nor am I in any way interested in the outcome hereof. 13 14 15 16 17 S/ Sara L. Kern 18 12th of March, 2021 19 Signature of Approved Transcriber Date 20 21 Sara L. Kern, CET**D-338 22 King Transcription Services 3 South Corporate Drive, Suite 203 23 Riverdale, NJ 07457 (973) 237-6080 2.4 25